UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/039,306	10/22/2001	Richard William Kadel JR.	38671-6111	8288

33123 7590 12/15/2004

DAVID A. HALL
HELLER EHRMAN ET AL.
4350 LA JOLLA VILLAGE DRIVE #700
SAN DIEGO, CA 92122

EXAMINER	
HO, THE T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/039,306	KADEL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	The Thanh Ho	2126	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 October 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-80* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-80* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *8/21/2002*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the application filed 10/22/2001.

2. Claims 1-80 have been examined and are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. The following terms lack antecedent basis:

(i) the processing criteria (lines 1-2 claim 13). Correction is required.

(ii) the indicated relationship (lines 1-2 claim 14). Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 24-30, 32-36, 57-63, 65-67, 69-70, 75 and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wason U.S Patent No. 6,701,383.

As to claim 1, Wason teaches an extensible framework for use in a computer system (uniform synchronization within extensible time-based framework, Fig. 2) that supports an object oriented programming environment (is implemented in Java, an architecture-neutral, object-oriented, multithreaded language intended for use in distributed environments, lines 30-36 column 4), the framework comprising a set of object classes (audio media object, image media object, video media object, custom objects, Fig. 2) that can be extended using object oriented principles (...JVM is stored in one location and instantiated separately for each extension module, eliminating the need to store duplicate copies of the JVM for other modules that are also implemented in Java..., lines 40-43 column 4) to define an information handling application (applications built on top of the framework, line 40 column 1) with data objects comprising a class of data source objects (audio media object, image media object, video media object, Fig. 2) and a class of data consumer objects (custom objects 230, Fig. 2), and a mediation layer (synchronization abstraction layer SAL 270, Fig. 2) that defines an interface between the data source objects and the data consumer objects to permit data communications between the two data object classes (...abstraction layer providing a uniform interface between a framework and one or more plug-ins, the invention is a Synchronization Abstraction Layer SAL abstracting time-based frameworks into a common synchronization interface..., lines 27-31 column 2), such that the class configuration of the data source objects can be specified independently of

the class configuration of the data consumer objects (platform independent version of a plug-in, lines 10-11 column 2; the SAL synchronizes itself and other plug-ins to a time-line of the underlying framework and it does that independently of the underlying framework, lines 31-34 column 2).

Wason does not explicitly teach a memory in which data objects can be stored. However, the system of Wason is implemented on a client station (Fig. 2). Moreover, Wason teaches that the high level diagram of Figs. 1-2 omit many other components and processes, including an operating system and rendering means (lines 38-40 and 52-53 column 3). "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantage of providing for a memory in a computer station is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to include a memory into the system of Wason because it would provide the proper storage for the data objects.

As to claim 2, it is a system claim of claim 1. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above.

As to claim 3, Wason as modified further teaches the mediation layer defines a data interface that provides an information exchange standard between the data source objects and the data consumer objects (communications between ClientFramworkX 220 and Extension Module 230 using uniform interface 271 of SAL 270, Fig. 2).

As to claim 24, Wason as modified further teaches the data interface of the mediation layer provides a wrapper for the data objects (platform independent version of a plug-in, lines 10-11 column 2; the SAL synchronizes itself and other plug-ins to a time-

line of the underlying framework and it does that independently of the underlying framework, lines 31-34 column 2).

As to claim 25, Wason as modified further teaches data exchange occurs without providing contextual data characteristics to a receiving data object (platform independent version of a plug-in, lines 10-11 column 2).

As to claim 26, Wason as modified further teaches the contextual data characteristics are supplied by the data object wrapper (...the plug-ins interact with the underlying framework through the SAL, rather than directly. Typically, the SAL is implemented on top of the synchronization of the Application Programming Interfaces provided by the underlying frameworks..., lines 34-38 column 2).

As to claim 27, it is a system claim of claim 25. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 25 above.

As to claim 28, Wason as modified further teaches a plug-in manager object class that integrates service components into the application (Java classes, lines 23-39 column 5).

As to claim 29, Wason as modified further teaches data service components interact with other components of the application to determine if a service is required and to determine parameters that are to be interchanged (...when a user invokes the RealPlayer application and the TOC extension module, RealPlayer 301 accesses Web Server 320 over Network 330 to retrieve "toc.smi," a synchronized multimedia integration language descriptor file defining a set of synchronized plug-ins to run simultaneously in the RealPlayer environment..., lines 9-22 column 5).

As to claim 30, Wason as modified further teaches the service determination occurs upon introduction of newly loaded components (...when a user invokes the RealPlayer application and the TOC extension module..., lines 9-10 column 5).

As to claims 32-33, they are system claims of claims 24 and 26, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 24 and 26 above.

As to claim 34, Wason as modified further teaches the InfoModel object receives a data source object for exposure to the data consumer objects, selects available attributes and methods of the received data source object for data characterization, and determines if the addition of attributes or methods to the data source object are appropriate (lines 10-39 column 5).

As to claim 35, Wason as modified further teaches the domain is defined using XML schema (...the framework-independent layer can be implemented using different languages, including XML..., lines 1-3 column 3).

As to claim 36, it is a method claim of claims 2-3. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 2-3 above.

As to claims 57-63 and 65-67, they are method claims of claims 24-30 and 32-34, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 24-30 and 32-34 above.

As to claims 69-70, they are system claims of claims 1 and 3, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 3 above.

As to claim 75, it is a computer program product claim of claims 2-3. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 2-3 above.

As to claim 80, it is a method claim of claims 1, 29-30 and 34. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 29-30 and 24 above.

5. Claims 4-23, 31, 37-56, 64, 68, 71-74 and 76-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wason in view of Sabelhaus U.S Patent No. 6,708,207.

As to claim 4, Wason as modified does not explicitly teach attribute/metadata object class. Sabelhaus teaches a system of communication between objects (Fig. 1) through an API (API 60, Fig. 1) wherein the API includes attribute/metadata object class that specifies attributes, including metadata, and that provide declarative and procedural information relating to attributes in the object (lines 4-38 column 4). It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Sabelhaus to the system of Wason because this allows the objects to communicate with each other using the specific attributes of the objects provided in the API.

As to claim 5, Sabelhaus further teaches Relationship object class that specifies relationships between objects (...the base class 76 includes function calls, methods, parameters, behaviors, and other attributes shared by all or at least some of the ME classes 74..., lines 23-26 column 4).

As to claim 6, Sabelhaus further teaches object class that specifies a group of related attributes, methods, and semantic information that indicates data processing to be available for the specified attributes, including the specific intent of said attributes (separate base classes inside API 60, Fig. 1; lines 21-38 column 4).

As to claim 7, Sabelhaus further teaches object class that specifies change event registration for detecting changes in the data objects (...command object 72 includes base functionality that is used by the ME classes 74 to access the database 66 or perform functions within the common MIB 32, such as communicating with the low level software driver 34 in order to determine or change the state of hardware in the NE 10..., lines 26-31 column 4).

As to claim 8, Sabelhaus further teaches class of objects that specify semantic information indicating data processing to be available for specified attributes and intended use of the attributes of a data object (lines 4-38 column 4).

As to claim 9, Sabelhaus further teaches a class of objects that define a desired format of a data object attribute specified by a class (ME classes 74 each include specific functionality for an ME type, lines 22-23 column 4).

As to claim 10, Sabelhaus further teaches an attribute alias may be specified by a user to indicate any data source attributes of an attribute domain that may be substituted with attributes of a different attribute domain (...an OSI defined management service containing an interface with a user, specifying the service provided, and a protocol, specifying the protocol data unit format and the associated procedures..., lines 41-45 column 3).

As to claim 11, Sabelhaus further teaches attribute/metadata interface provides input/output functions for display and editing of the attribute during runtime (lines 21-38 column 4).

As to claim 12, Sabelhaus further teaches a FieldMetaData attribute that specifies processing criteria for an attribute of a data object (...attributes of an ME class 74 are inherited by the command objects 72 through the base class 76 to generate the ME command object 78..., lines 17-19 column 5).

As to claim 13, Sabelhaus further teaches the processing criteria relates to a selected attribute of the data object for display processing (lines 14-21 column 5).

As to claim 14, Sabelhaus further teaches the indicated relationship may be resolved using a version of the Relationship object in cache of the computer system (lines 38-46 column 5).

As to claim 15, Wason as modified further teaches a collaboration facility that permits a user at a network computer remote from the computer system to share a view of a data object at the remote network computer (viewing multimedia files from the client station, lines 28-41 column 3).

As to claim 16, Sabelhaus further teaches the collaboration facility comprises a Metaview class of data objects that lightweight encapsulate elements of a data object for visual reconstruction on a display screen of the remote network computer (lines 14-29 column 5).

As to claim 17, Sabelhaus further teaches the data interface provides an override function that can override default metadata of the data object attributes (lines 31-41 column 5).

As to claim 18, it is a system claim of claim 17. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 17 above.

As to claim 19, it is a system claim of claims 4-7 and 11. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 4-7 and 11 above.

As to claim 20, Sabelhaus further teaches the attributes and relationships include contextual metadata, and the events and methods are defined with respect to the contextual metadata (...The ME class objects 74 each include functionality associated with a particular ME type. Such functionality includes ME attributes methods, parameters, and behavior for the ME type. Attributes of an ME class 74 are inherited by the command objects 72 through the base class 76 to generate the ME command object 78. As previously described, the ME command object 78 provides an interface for accessing data and functionality in the common MIB 32..., lines 14-21 column 5).

As to claim 21, Sabelhaus further teaches object classes that include methods that provide data exposure, and further including a Data Source Interface object class of data objects with methods that automatically determine which data exposure method will be used for data communications between the data source objects and data consumer objects (lines 21-39 column 4).

As to claim 22, Sabelhaus further teaches the determined data exposure method comprises data object reflection and introspection (lines 40-55 column 4).

As to claim 23, Sabelhaus further teaches the data exposure methods include a data source object method that provides a standard interface, a data source object and a Translator object that maps an alternate data interface to the standard interface, and a data source object that is inspected by the computer system to determine available data

fields which are thereby exposed to data consumer objects by the standard interface (lines 21-55 column 4).

As to claim 31, it is a system claim of claims 6 and 23. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 6 and 23 above.

As to claims 37-56, 64 and 68, they are method claims of claims 4-23, 31 and 35, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 4-23, 31 and 35 above.

As to claims 71-74, they are system claims of claims 4-7, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 4-7 above.

As to claims 76-79, they are computer program product claims of claims 4-7, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 4-7 above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to The Thanh Ho whose telephone number is (571) 272-3762. A voice mail service is also available for this number. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday, 8:30 am – 5:00 pm.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or fax to:

- AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 872 - 9306.
- OFFICAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 872 - 9306.
- NON OFFICAL faxes should not be signed, please send to (571) 273 – 3762

TTH
December 2, 2004

MENGAL T AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100